## REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in the present patent application. Claims 1-7 stand rejected. By this amendment, claims 8-10 have been added. This application now includes claims 1-10.

Applicant has amended claim 1 in order to change the term "for engaging" to -- that engages -- to improve the readability of the claim. The amendment to claim 1 was not made for reasons related to patentability.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 455,334 (Iske, et al.). The Examiner asserts that Iske, et al. discloses a turn button having a head portion (f) and a shaft F having a leading helical end portion F', and means for self-alignment of the shaft with the aperture of the lock mechanism as the shaft is inserted into the aperture (relying on column 2, lines 74-94). Applicant respectfully disagrees, and requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-7.

Iske, et al. discloses that, "[t]he object of this invention is to facilitate the unlatching and opening of doors by persons whose arms are encumbered, or who for any other reason find it more convenient to merely press forward on the knob than to take hold of it and turn the wrist and hand in the ordinary way." (Iske, et al. page 1, lines 12-18). Thus, Iske, et al. discloses a mechanism which changes the linear motion of pushing on the door knob into a rotary motion to operate the latch bolt C. In addition, Iske, et al. discloses a door knob shank F with "the middle part F' of said shank being twisted, as shown, through a quarter-circle...." (Iske, et al. page 1, lines 53-54; emphasis added). Further, Iske, et al. discloses door knobs G and G' which unlatch the latch bolt C, but do not operate a lock mechanism. There simply is no discussion of a lock mechanism in Iske, et al.

Claim 1 is directed to a lockset, and recites, in part, "a turn-button mounted to said operator, said turn-button including: a head portion; and a shaft extending from said head portion, said shaft having a leading helical end portion that engages said aperture of said lock mechanism." In contrast, Iske, et al. discloses at page 1, lines 53-54 that it is the middle part F' of the shank F that is twisted through a quarter-circle...." As shown in Iske, et al. Fig. 3, the leading end portion of shank F is blunt, square and without any twist for some distance before reaching the twisted middle part F' of the shank F. Accordingly, Iske, et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest a turn-button including a shaft having a leading helical end portion that engages the aperture of the lock mechanism, as recited in claim 1.

Also, Applicant's operator is analogous to knobs G, G', but Iske, et al. does not disclose structure corresponding to the recited turn-button mounted to said operator, as recited in claim 1.

In addition, while Iske, et al. discloses door knobs G and G' which unlatch the latch bolt C, door knobs G and G' do not operate a lock mechanism. There simply is no disclosure of a lock mechanism in Iske, et al. The aperture through which shaft F is inserted is part of a latch mechanism, not a lock mechanism.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance in its present form.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, and are believed to be allowable in view of their dependence from otherwise allowable base claim 1. In addition, claims 2 and 3 are believed allowable in their own right.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and further recites, "said leading helical end portion having a plurality of leading helical surfaces that taper and twist from a transition line of said shaft toward a tip end of said shaft." In contrast, Iske, et al. discloses that it is the middle part

F' of the shank F that is twisted through a quarter-circle...." As shown in Iske, et al. Fig. 3, the leading end portion of shank F is blunt, square and without any twist for some distance before reaching the twisted middle part F' of the shank F. Thus, there is no plurality of leading helical surfaces that taper and twist from a transition line of the shaft toward a tip end of the shaft. Accordingly, claim 2 is believed allowable in its own right.

Claim 3 depends from claim 2, and further recites that "said plurality of leading helical surfaces smoothly transition between adjacent helical surfaces." In contrast, Iske, et al. discloses an abrupt change from one surface to an adjacent surface, as is clearly shown in Iske, et al. Fig. 3. Accordingly, claim 3 is believed allowable in its own right.

In addition, claim 3 is believed to be allowable in view of its dependence from otherwise allowable intervening claim 2.

Claim 4 is directed to a turn-button for a lockset. Claim 4 recites "a head portion; and a shaft extending from said head portion, said shaft having a leading helical end portion." Iske, et al. fails to disclose a turn-button for a lock set. As defined in Applicant's specification at page 2, lines 25-29, the turn-button is a device that operates a lock mechanism. In contrast, Iske, et al. discloses door knobs G and G' which unlatch the latch bolt C, but do not operate a lock mechanism. There simply is no disclosure of a lock mechanism in Iske, et al.

Notwithstanding the above, Iske, et al. discloses at page 1, lines 53-54 that it is the middle part F' of the shank F that is twisted through a quarter-circle...." As shown in Fig. 3, the leading end portion of shank F is blunt, square and without any twist for some distance before reaching the twisted middle part F' of the shank F. Accordingly, Iske, et al. does not

disclose, teach or suggest a turn-button including a shaft having a leading helical end portion, as recited in claim 4.

Accordingly, claim 4 is believed to be in condition for allowance in its present form.

Claims 5 and 6 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 4, and are believed to be allowable in view of their dependence from otherwise allowable base claim 4. In addition, claims 5 and 6 are believed allowable in their own right for substantially the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 2 and 3, respectively. In addition, claim 6 is believed to be allowable in view of its dependence from otherwise allowable intervening claim 5.

Claim 7 is directed to a lockset. Claim 7 recites, "a lock mechanism including an actuator having an aperture; an operator; a turn-button mounted to said operator, said turn-button including a shaft; and means for facilitating self-alignment of said shaft of said turn-button with said aperture of said lock mechanism as said shaft of said turn-button is inserted into said aperture of said lock mechanism.

As set forth above with respect to claim 1, there is no disclosure of a lock mechanism in Iske, et al. The aperture through which shaft F is inserted is part of a latch mechanism, not a lock mechanism.

Furthermore, and notwithstanding the above, Iske, et al. provides no means for facilitating self-alignment of said shaft of said turn-button with said aperture of said lock mechanism as said shaft of said turn-button is inserted into said aperture of said lock mechanism. As shown in Fig. 3 of Iske, et al., the leading end portion of shank F is blunt, square and without any twist for some distance before reaching the twisted middle part F' of the shank F. Accordingly, in Iske, et al. the leading end portion of shank F must be in perfect alignment, vertically, horizontally and rotationally, with "square recess D' of the hub" D in

order for the leading end portion of shank F to be received in the square recess D' of the hub D (see, Iske, et al., page 1, lines 46-48).

In rejecting claim 7, reliance is placed on the passage in Iske, et al. at page 1 (column 2), lines 74-94. However, the cited passage is directed to the operation of the Iske, et al. invention, and is not related to facilitating self-alignment of a shank F with square recess D' of the hub D of the latch assembly. Accordingly, the cited passage further is not related to facilitating self-alignment of a shaft of a turn-button with an aperture of a lock mechanism as the shaft of the turn-button is inserted into the aperture of the lock mechanism, as recited in claim 7.

Accordingly, claim 7 is believed to be in condition for allowance in its present form.

New claim 8, depending from claim 1, finds support in Applicant's specification at, for example, page 2, lines 30-33 and page 3, lines 8-15. Claim 8 further and patentably defines Applicant's invention over the prior art, and is believed allowable in its present form.

New claims 9 and 10, depending from claim 7, correspond generally to existing claims 2 and 3, respectively. Claims 9 and 10 further and patentably define Applicant's invention over the prior art, and are believed allowable in their present form for substantially the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 2 and 3.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the present claims are in condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of all rejections and allowance of the claims.

In the event Applicant has overlooked the need for an extension of time, an additional extension of time, payment of fee, or additional payment of fee, Applicant hereby

conditionally petitions therefor and authorizes that any charges be made to Deposit Account No. 20-0095, TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.

Should any question concerning any of the foregoing arise, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (317) 894-0801.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald K. Aust
Registration No. 36,735

Attorney for Applicants

RKA/ts

TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.
12029 E. Washington Street
Indianapolis, IN 46229
Telephone: 317-894-0801
Facsimile: 317-894-0803

Enc.: Return postcard

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on: December 28, 2004.

Ronald K. Aust, Reg. No. 36,735
Name of Registered Representative

Signature

December 28, 2004
Date